



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,458	03/09/2001	Tsung-en Andy Lee	JCLA5633	7016
7590 02/17/2004				
J.C. PATENTS INC. 4 VENTURE, SUITE 250 IRVINE, CA 92618		EXAMINER TUNG, KEE M		
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
		2676		
		DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004 3		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/802,458

Applicant(s)

LEE, TSUNG-EN ANDY

Examiner

Kee M Tung

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18, 21-29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17, 19, 20, 30, 32 and 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-16, 18, 21-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al (5,781,242 hereinafter "Kondo") in view of Andrews et al (5,572,695 hereinafter "Andrews").

Kondo teaches an image processing apparatus (Fig. 2) and mapping method for frame memory (abstract) comprising a frame buffer (5) for storing input image data in a line-by-line pattern (col. 4, lines 54-56) and read out the stored data in a block-by-block manner (col. 4, lines 57-58); a memory controller (13) for controlling access to the frame memory for writing or reading the image data in or from the frame memory and configured to access the frame memory either a raster unit (line-by-line) consisting of one line of plural piece of element data in the first predetermined number of rows and columns or a block unit (block-by-block) consisting of plural piece of element data arranged in a matrix of second predetermined numbers of rows and columns; a JPEG codec (15) for compressing/decompressing the image data in block (it is noted that JPEG is an ISO/ITU standard for storing images in compressed form using a Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT)). However, Kondo fails to explicitly teach or suggest a first and second mapping schemes for translating logical addresses to physical addresses.

Art Unit: 2676

These are what Andrews teaches (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of mapping scheme of Andrews into Kondo in order to access any of a plurality of memory locations within the frame memory as taught by Andrews (col. 1, lines 8-18). Therefore, at least claims 1, 4 and 5 would have been obvious.

As per claims 2 and 3, the combined system fails to explicitly teach an initialization step prior to step (a) is performed so as to set up a write logic address and a read logic address to zero and then incremented by 1 per write or read. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to implement the teachings of Kondo and Andrews in order to properly tracking the address locations in the memory for accessing. Therefore, at least claims 2 and 3 would have been obvious.

Claims 6-12, 15, 16, and 18 are similar in scope to claims 1-6, and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 13 and 14, Kondo teaches the buffer is a pre-buffer or a staging buffer (12 or 14).

Claims 21-29 and 31 are similar in scope to claims 6-9, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 18, and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 10 and 23 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s)

Art Unit: 2676

in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The step (d)/(e) is repeated from step (b)/(c).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 17, 19, 20, 30, 32 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art made of record fails to anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention. Specifically, the prior art fails to suggest or teach, in combination with the remaining steps, each pixel has a 9-bit pixel address which is separated to a 3-bit dot address, ..., as recited in claims 17 and 30; the physical address in the first mapping scheme is equivalent to, ..., as recited in claims 19-20 and 32-33.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kee M Tung whose telephone number is 703-305-9660. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 5:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 703-308-6829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kee M Tung
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2676